



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/165,683	10/02/1998	YEVGENIY EUGENE SHTEYN	PHA23-483	8198

7590 10/24/2002
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/165,683

Applicant(s)

SHTEYN, YEVGENIY EUGENE

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,467,264 to Rauch in view of International Publication No. WO 98/16886 to Chambers.

As to claim 1, Rauch teaches (column 1, lines 33 – 57; column 2, lines 56 – 67) a system for controlling devices with a first physical component (first device), a second physical component (second device), a first property (status of first device) that is changeable through a first call (in step 706, the routine calls a transmitter driver routine which corresponds to a transmitter...the transmitter transmits a signal...to the device...the transmitted signal activates or deactivates the device 130, column 9, lines 56 – 67), a second property (status of second device) that is changeable through a second call (transmitter driver routine; column 9, lines 60 – 65). The system (column 1, lines 39 – 53) enables registering a property route linking first device and second device (defining a dependency relationship) such that a change in the first property causes a change of the second property (the second device has a status which depends on the status of the first device). Rauch teaches (column 2, lines 47 – 50) the

Art Unit: 2126

status of a device also changes when a device sends an identifier (signal) to the computer indicating that it has become activated or deactivated. Rauch teaches (column 10, lines 47 – 65) that each signal corresponds to a digital waveform, which identifies a device identifier and a status (for each device 130 identified by device identifier 1002, a digital waveform is stored, see command table 184, Fig. 10). Therefore, the signal of Rauch is the identifier that invokes the dependency relationship because the signal represents a device identifier and its status and the signal causes the status of dependent devices to be updated (column 2, lines 55 – 63). Rauch is silent as to whether the devices are represented by software objects.

However, Chambers teaches (P. 9, lines 20 – 32) an information processing system with a first physical component (real device 102 – 116, Fig. 1) represented by a first software object (abstract device 202, Fig. 2), a second physical component object (real device 102 – 116, Fig. 1) represented by a second component object (abstract device 202, Fig. 2), and changeable properties (status of abstract device changes). The system (P. 10, lines 30 – 34) enables registering a route (event) linking first object (abstract device wishing to notify) and second object (abstract device interested in being notified) such that property changes are sent to interested abstract devices.

It would have been obvious that the devices of Rauch would also be represented by software objects as taught by Chambers because the devices of Rauch and Chambers are both consumer electronic devices (column 10, lines 64 – 67 of Rauch; p. 7, lines 9 – 12 of Chambers).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 2, Rauch teaches (column 2, lines 55 – 63) changing properties (status of device changes), initiating look-up action (search device status table) to identify property routes using identifiers (locate all entries with a device condition field containing an identification of device), and initializing matching property routes (update status).

As to claim 3 and 5, Rauch teaches (column 45 – 67) the identifier (device condition field) comprises a reference (contains identifiers) to a scenario of the operating system (conditions the device depends on).

As to claim 4 and 6, Rauch teaches (column 1, lines 39 – 51) a system that enables registering a property route (define a dependency relationship) and the property route comprises a reference to the software application (identification of device which the device has a dependency relationship).

As to 7, Chambers teaches (P. 11, lines 18 – 20) un-registering routes.

It would have been obvious that the dependency relationship of Rauch could also be un-registered when it is no longer desired.

As to claims 8 and 9, these are method claims that correspond to the system claims 1 – 2; note the rejections of claims 1 – 2 above, which also meet these method claims.

Response to Arguments

3. The applicant argues (p. 3, lines 23 – 24) “Rauch neither suggests nor discloses an identifier in the first call that enables conditionally invoking the dependency relationship”. The examiner disagrees because Rauch teaches (column 2, lines 47 – 50) the status of a device also changes when a device

Art Unit: 2126

sends an identifier (signal) to the computer indicating that it has become activated or deactivated. In addition, Rauch teaches (column 10, lines 47 – 65) that each signal corresponds to a digital waveform, which identifies a device identifier and a status (for each device 130 identified by device identifier 1002, a digital waveform is stored, see command table 184, Fig. 10). Therefore, the signal of Rauch is the identifier that invokes the dependency relationship because the signal represents a device identifier and its status and the signal causes the status of dependent devices to be updated (column 2, lines 55 – 63).

The applicant argues (p. 4, lines 1 – 2) “Rauch teaches away from conditionally invoking the dependency relationship since all identified dependency relationships are invoked.” The examiner disagrees because the fact that Rauch invokes all identified dependency relationships does not suggest that Rauch does not conditionally invoke dependency relationship because Rauch clearly teaches conditionally invoking dependency relationship (dependency relationship is defined such that the second device has a status which depends on the status of the first device, column 1, lines 40 – 45). Perhaps the applicant’s argument is that the limitation “conditionally invoking” means invoking only one dependency relationship. However, Rauch also teaches invoking only one dependency relationship. Consider the situation when only one dependency relationship has been defined. When Rauch “invokes all identified dependency relationships”, Rauch would in fact invoke only one dependency relationship because only one dependency relationship has been defined.

Art Unit: 2126

The applicant argues (p. 4, lines 4 – 5) “Rauch neither discloses nor suggests a first call to the first device that caused its state to change.” The examiner disagrees because Rauch teaches (column 9, lines 56 – 67) a call to a device that caused its state to change (in step 706, the routine calls a transmitter driver routine which corresponds to a transmitter...the transmitter transmits a signal...to the device...the transmitted signal activates or deactivates the device 130).

The applicant argues (p. 4, lines 12 – 14) “Chambers neither suggests or discloses the claim limitation of the first call to the first object having an associated an identifier enabling to conditionally invoke the route.” The examiner agrees with the applicant’s argument, but the Chambers reference was not relied upon to provide the teaching of the first call to the first object having an associated an identifier enabling to conditionally invoke the route. Instead, Chambers was used to provide the teaching of representing devices with software objects (see rejection above).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

Art Unit: 2126

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3406. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8am - 4:30pm.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

lbz
October 4, 2002



ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100